

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/724,264	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JENSEN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Maryam Monshipouri	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Maryam Monshipouri.

(2) Ms. Viola Kung.

**Date of Interview:** 18 September 2008

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
112 secon and rejinder under reOchiaid

Claims discussed:  
1, 16, 19, 25

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner indicated that the language of claims 1 and 25 is confusing and suggested an amendment (see attached Ex. amendment). Ms. Kung agreed with said amendment and also requested rejoinder of claims 16 and 19 with the elected invention which was granted by the Examiner. Ms. Kung also gave authority to the examiner to amend the claims in an Ex. amendment and cancel non-elected claims.